Wednesday, 15 May, 1946 1 2 3 & INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 4 S Court House of the Tribunal p War Ministry Building 5 Tokyo, Japan at 6 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 7 at 0930. 8 9 Appearances: 10 For the Tribunal, same as before. 11 For the Prosecution Section, same as before with 12 the addition of: MR. JUSTICE W. G. F. BORGERHOFF MULDER, 13 Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of the Kingdom of 14 the Netherlands; and COLONEL S. Y. ROSENBLITT, Assist-15 ant to the Associate Counsel acting on behalf of the 16 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. 17 For the Defense Section, same as before. 18 19 (English to Japanese and Japanese 20 to English interpretation was made by OKA, 21 Takashi of statements from the floor, and 22 English to Japanese interpretation was made 23

by MASUTANI, Hideo of statements by the

President, Hidekazu Hayashi acting as Monitor.)

24

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal For the Far East is now resumed.

MR. KEENAN: If it please the Court,

I have the honor to present Mr. Justice Borgerhoff

Mulder, Judge in the District Court of The Hague and

Justice in the Special Court for War Criminals,

Associate Prosecutor from the Netherlands.

CAPTAIN COLEMAN: If the Tribunal please, I am Captain Coleman of American defense counsel and have been duly designated by all of the defendants to appear on their behalf.

The Japanese defense counsel asked me to present to the Tribunal their request that the proceedings in Court be conducted in the manner employed the day before yesterday, at which time the translation of remarks was given in Japanese, to be heard by both the defendants and their Japanese counsel. Since many of them do not understand English, they are not aware of what is taking place unless the translation is given in Japanese. Now the Japanese counsel are not in a position to make proper objections at the necessary times or otherwise function as counsel at this trial. This change is considered essential to the conduct of a fair trial. The defense, therefore, requests that the proceeding you followed yesterday be discontinued and the former procedure resumed.

It is my understanding that the prosecution has no objection to the granting of this request and that it is likewise agreeable to the Tribunal's translation officer.

Captain Kleiman will present this morning's motion, and he has prepared his remarks in short sentences that can readily be translated as given.

THE PRESIDENT: The procedure followed the day before yesterday and on preceding days would have been followed yesterday but for the fact that the defense counsel concerned, having been briefed rather late, were unable to give their addresses and arguments to the translators in order to produce a satisfactory translation in time, as it was given yesterday.

Of course, we shall revert to the procedure of the day before yesterday as soon as that is possible. But, we also accede to the request of Captain Coleman who, we understand, now represents all accused, to have the short sentences translated sentence by sentence.

Captain Coleman, we have a letter, I suppose you would call it, addressed to us, signed by all accused end, as far as we can judge, by all accused's counsel, appointing you to be representative of all accused, jointly and separately. Would you make a formal announcement to that effect so it may go into the record.

5 €

8 9

CAPTAIN COLEMAN: If the Court please, there was filed with the General Secretary of the Tribunal this morning the written designation, signed by all the accused and by their counsel, appointing me their Chief American Counsel, to represent them jointly and separately. This was filed as required by the Charter, and I accept the responsibility.

THE PRESIDENT: That makes your position perfectly clear now.

Captain Kleiman.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please the Tribunal, this motion is made on behalf of the defendant, Kiichiro HIRANUMA and of four other defendants. We deny that this Tribunal has jurisdiction over the offenses alleged or over these defendants to try the crimes alleged in this Indictment.

THE PRESIDENT: You do not have to -
(Whereupon, the interpreter interrupted
to interpret the statement by Captain Kleiman.)

(Addressing the interpreter): Go ahead.

The only motion on the paper today is the motion for particulars.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Sir, I wish to point something else out. I think you will understand. May I continue?

We also denied that the Indictment and the

counts allege any crime known under international law.

However, we will assume these facts only for the purpose of this motion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

30

21

22

23

24

25

We object against this Indictment and its counts. We move that the Tribunal order the prosecution to furnish these defendants a bill of particulars concerning each offense alleged. This motion is made on the ground that the Indictment and the counts do not, in simple language, plainly, concisely, definitely, and adequately state the essential facts constituting each offense charged. The Indictment and the counts are indefinite in their allegations. They state not facts, but conclusions. They present not simple allegations of the essential elements of the alleged crimes, but what is a matter of evidence. They contain matters irrelevant to the offenses alleged. The legal requirement of a clear, understandable statement of the crime charged, like other legal precepts, was instituted for the protection of the oppressed. These legal precepts go back to the days of the Magna Charta. Their purpose is to protect those charged with crime, to insure justice at their trial. Justice goes to the heart of what the Allies fought for in this war.

Section Four of Appendix D of this Indictment states that Japanese trials of prisoners of war were not

fairly conducted. There have been accusations that those trials, German, and Italian trials have been farces, trials in name only. It has been decided that this will not be such a trial. Legal precedent cannot so be established. Thus, it has been stated that the trial of these defendants will be held in accordance with Anglo-American principles of fairness. In accordance with such principles, the Fresident of this Court has announced that the prosecution has the burden of establishing the guilt of these defendants beyond a reasonable doubt. In accordance with these principles, following the provisions of the Magna Charta and of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States, an Indictment has been filed herein. In accordance with these principles, Article 9 of this Tribunal's Charter provides as follows:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"ARTICLE 9. Procedure for Fair Trial. In order to insure fair trial for the accused the following procedure shall be followed:

"a. Indictment. The indictment shall consist of a plain, concise, and adequate statement of each offense charged. Each accused shall be furnished, in adequate time for defense, a copy of the indictment, including any amendment, and of this Charter, in a language understood by the accused."

I beg the Tribunal's indulgence to allow me to cite Anglo-American principles concerning the nature and purpose of an indictment.

What is the nature of an indictment? It is an accusation. Its function is to charge the crime and to clearly inform the defendant of the offense alleged against him so that he may understand why he is charged, so that he may be able to prepare his defense, so that he may be able to recall specific instances and to prepare himself for the cross-examination of his accusers, so that he may know which specific witnesses, documents, or other means of evidence he must seek in order to present the truth before his triers. In other words, so that he may --

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kleiman, there is no need to shout.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Oh, excuse me, I am very sorry, sir. Thank you very much.

In other words, so that he may prepare for trial.

The Indictment and the counts, like the charges and specifications of a court martial action, must be based on facts, documents and legal evidence, not on conclusions or opinions. The Indictment and the counts, like the charge and specification, must be in simple,

concise language and state definitely and adequately facts constituting the essential elements of each offense charged. Each offense must be charged by a separate count or a separate specification. Each separate offense must state a specific statutory or other legal provision that the defendant is alleged to have violated. One count or one specification must not allege more than one offense.

This Indictment and the counts accuse these defendants of various criminal offenses. Japan is not indicted. Japan is not charged with these crimes. The title of the Indictment names these defendants individually. The heading of the Indictment states that these defendants committed the various alleged crimes. The headings of Groups One, Two and Three allege that these defendants are individually responsible.

Let us examine the Indictment to determine whether it or its counts, in simple, concise, understandable language, particularly and adequately allege the essential elements of each offense charged.

In charging any crime the following must be alleged: the name of the accused, a statement of when the offense was committed, a statement of how or in what manner the offense was committed, a statement that the offense was in violation of a particular

Goldberg & Yel

statutory or other legal provision which makes the offense a crime; where criminal intent is an essential element of the crime, a statement that the defendant acted with an intent to commit a crime; where the gist of the crime consists in the unlawfulness of the means employed in committing this crime, these means must be set forth.

The heading of the Indictment alleges, among many other allegations, that these defendants entered into a conspiracy between themselves and with rulers of other countries; the main object of this conspiracy was to secure the domination of the rest of the world. What is a conspiracy? It is a confederation to effect an illegal object by legal means or a legal object by illegal means, and it is a misdemeanor at common law.

What must be alleged in stating this offense? The date when this conspiracy was agreed upon, the place where it was agreed upon, the specific persons with whom the accused conspired, the specific criminal object of the conspiracy, the joint criminal intent, the unlawful means used in effectuating the conspiracy, the specific statutory or other legal provision violated.

Let us look at the ordinary manner of

expressing a charge and specification thereunder.

Charge 1: Violation of the 96th Article of War.

Specification: In that John Wilson Jones, a private in the Army of the United States, at Yucatah County, in the State of Georgia, in the City of Atlanta, on or about the 15th day of May, 1945, agreed and conspired with Harold Johnson and Frank Wilson to defraud the United States by obtaining the allowance of a false and fraudulent claim against the United States in the amount of fifty dollars for supplies alleged to have been furnished to the United States by Harold Wilson Jones, which claim was false and fraudulent in that (blank for particular statement), and was then known by the said John Wilson Jones to be false and fraudulent.

Let us examine the ordinary, simple manner of stating an indictment for murder, inasmuch as murder is one of the offenses charged by this Indictment.

"United States of America versus John Doe.

Violation of United States Code Section 451. The Grand

Jury charges: On or about the 6th day of January,

1941, at New York City, in the Southern District of

New York, and on land acquired for the use of the

United States and under the exclusive jurisdiction of

the United States, John Doe, with premeditation, shot and murdered John Roe."

Thus, indictments and charges, as we American attorneys have known them in the past, have simply stated the essential elements of the offenses charged.

Had civilized nations the courage and the honest desire in the past to live peaceably with each other and to renounce war as a crime, had they honestly incorporated their desire in any particular provision of any covenant or convention, had this provision been accepted by the common consent of civilized nations, this Indictment and the counts thereof would have stated more simply the alleged facts. Had there been an Article of the League of Nations Covenant which stated that war is a crime, the Indictment might have read thusly:

"United Nations versus (specific defendants).

Violation of the 12th Article of the League of Nations

Covenant. The United Nations charge these defendants

(specifying who they are) on or about the 10th day of

September, 1932, at (a particular city), of (a particular country), did conspire with persons whose names

are specifically mentioned therein for the purpose of

waging aggressive war in violation of international

1aw."

However, we have never had such a provision in any treaty, in any convention, in any international covenant.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Mr. President, in my submission, it is time to object to the continuance of this line of argument in support of what is supposed to be a motion for a bill of particulars asking in a number of paragraphs for certain specific particulars of this Indictment. We had, yesterday and the day before, elaborate arguments on the legal basis of the Indictment. No doubt it would be good for some of us to have instruction as to the manner of drawing an indictment in the legal procedure of each of the eleven countries represented on this Tribunal; but, in my submission, a motion for a bill of particulars is not the occasion for either of those forms of discussion, and I ask that learned counsel be restricted to the subject matter of this motion.

THE PRESIDENT: Most of what Captain Kleiman said has been unhelpful to the Members of the Tribunal. We are anxious to see in what way the particulars already appearing in the Indictment can be supplemented. So far, Captain Kleiman has not shown us how they can be. He may yet be able to do so. If this matter had

A 20 b 21 a

& 23

Halaback

been taken to Chambers, perhaps we would not have heard that which has fallen from the lips of Captain Kleiman.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May I add, the prosecution is most anxious to assist in respect of giving any further information or aid to the defense, whose difficulties we fully realize, in any legitimate manner to enable them to prepare their defense. But we cannot accede to the motion in its present form and reasons supporting it in its present form. If the suggestion which you have just made, sir, were adopted and the matter discussed in detail in Chambers, we should be most anxious to give any assistance in our power.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court is of the opinion that this matter can be handled most effectively and most expeditiously in Chambers, and we will adjourn to Chambers accordingly. The Court will stand recessed.

(Whereupon, at 1033, a recess
was taken until 1045, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: May I have the attention of all persons in the room, please. As Marshal of the Court, I have been directed by the President of the Tribunal to announce for the record that the present session stands adjourned. There will be a reconvention at the direction of the President for the next session of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East.

Spectators and personnel presently in the room will please remain seated until the accused leave the dock.

(Whereupon, at 1048, an adjournment was taken.)